



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/731,604	12/08/2003	Srikanth Karimisetty	021756-002100US	4746

51206 7590 08/10/2007  
TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW LLP  
TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER  
8TH FLOOR  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3834

EXAMINER
----------

MORRISON, JAY A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2168

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

08/10/2007

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/731,604

Applicant(s)

KARIMISSETTY ET AL.

Examiner

Jay A. Morrison

Art Unit

2168

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 May 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 7/18/07.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 5/22/07 has been entered.

### ***Remarks***

2. Claims 1-20 are pending.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation

under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

4. Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chang et al. ('Chang' hereinafter) (Patent Number 6,584,459) in view of Meffert (Patent Number 5,884,321).

As per claim 1, Chang teaches

A method of searching unstructured data stored in a database, the method comprising: (see abstract and background)

storing unstructured data in a column of a database table; (storing XML document, column 3, line 26 through column 4, line 18, column 7, line 45 through column 8, line 43)

allowing a user to identify elements in the unstructured data as indexed elements; (column 14, line 51 through column 15, line 10, figure 4)

in response to the user-identified elements, creating an intermediate index into the unstructured data from the user-identified elements; (column 8, lines 10-17)

and allowing a user to create queries on the unstructured data using the indexed elements. (column 8, lines 10-17, column 20, lines 5-40)

Chang does not explicitly indicate "the intermediate index comprising one or more database tables mapping the user-identified elements in the unstructured data as the indexed elements"

However, Meffert discloses "the intermediate index comprising one or more database tables mapping the user-identified elements in the unstructured data as the indexed elements" (user selection creates new data base tables to link, column 7, lines 25-35).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Chang and Meffert because using the steps of "the intermediate index comprising one or more database tables mapping the user-identified elements in the unstructured data as the indexed elements" would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by allowing for a system that bridges gaps between platforms. This gives the user the advantage of having a mapping function to track links across platforms.

As per claim 2, Chang teaches  
the queries specify at least one value and an operation that is to be performed on an identified element. (column 2, lines 61-67, column 7, line 46 through column 8, line 40, column 9, lines 11-28)

As per claim 3, Chang teaches

Art Unit: 2168

the queries further include a start date and an end date. (column 19, lines 1-14 and 56-64)

As per claim 4, Chang teaches

the unstructured data is stored in character large object (CLOB) format. (column 8, lines 18-42, column 9, lines 19-28, column 12, line 63 through column 13, line 40)

As per claim 5, Chang teaches

the unstructured data comprises a well-formed XML document stored within a column of a database table. (column 8, lines 18-42, column 9, lines 19-28, column 12, line 63 through column 13, line 40)

As per claim 6, Chang teaches

XML fields of the unstructured data are filled with transaction data from a database transaction based on a predefined mapping to multiple data sources. (column 2, lines 18-28)

As per claim 7, Chang teaches

the multiple data sources are comprise multiple tables of a database. (column 2, lines 29-40)

As per claim 8, Chang teaches

the unstructured data is part of an electronic record stored in a common repository of electronic records that provides an audit trail that cannot be altered or disabled by users of the system.

As per claim 9, Chang teaches

A method of searching XML data stored in a column of a database table in character large object (CLOB) format, the method comprising: (see abstract and background)

storing the XML data in the column of the database table, wherein the XML data comprises a first plurality of XML elements that conform to a first data type definition (DTD) and a second plurality of XML elements that conform to a second DTD; (column 8, lines 19-40, column 9, lines 14-28, column 10, lines 10-18, column 12, lines 35-48)

allowing a user to identify elements from the first and second plurality of XML elements in XML data as indexed elements; (column 14, line 51 through column 15, line 10, figure 4)

in response to the user-identified elements, creating an intermediate index into the XML data from the user-identified elements; (column 8, lines 10-17)

and allowing a user to create queries on the unstructured data using the indexed elements. (column 8, lines 10-17, column 20, lines 5-40)

Chang does not explicitly indicate "the intermediate index comprising one or more database tables configured to map the user-identified elements in the unstructured data as the indexed elements".

However, Meffert discloses "the intermediate index comprising one or more database tables configured to map the user-identified elements in the unstructured data as the indexed elements" (user selection creates new data base tables to link, column 7, lines 25-35).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Chang and Meffert because using the steps of "the intermediate index comprising one or more database tables configured to map the user-identified elements in the unstructured data as the indexed elements" would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by allowing for a system that bridges gaps between platforms. This gives the user the advantage of having a mapping function to track links across platforms.

As per claim 10, Chang teaches

the first and second DTDs include first and second XML elements, respectively, that share a common name but represent different types of data and wherein the user can create a first indexed element that represents the first XML element and not the second XML element and a second indexed element that represents the second XML element and not the first XML element. (column 8, lines 19-40, column 9, lines 14-28, column 10, lines 10-18, column 12, lines 35-48)

As per claim 11, Chang teaches



Art Unit: 2168

A computer system for searching unstructured data stored in a database, the computer system comprising: (see abstract and background)

a processor; (column 6, lines 15-27)

a database; (column 6, lines 15-27, column 7, lines 54-67))

and a computer-readable memory coupled to the processor, the computer-readable memory configured to store a computer program; (column 6, line 54 through column 7, line 2)

wherein the processor is operative with the computer program to:

(i) store unstructured data in a column of a database table; (column 3, line 26 through column 4, line 18, column 7, line 45 through column 8, line 43)

(ii) allow a user to identify elements in the unstructured data as indexed elements; (column 14, line 51 through column 15, line 10, figure 4)

(iii) in response to the user-identified elements, create an intermediate index into the unstructured data from the user-identified elements and (column 8, lines 10-17)

(iv) allow a user to create queries on the unstructured data using the indexed elements. (column 8, lines 10-17, column 20, lines 5-40)

Chang does not explicitly indicate "the intermediate index comprising one or more database tables configured to map the user-identified elements in the unstructured data as the indexed elements".

However, Meffert discloses "the intermediate index comprising one or more database tables configured to map the user-identified elements in the unstructured data

Art Unit: 2168

as the indexed elements" (user selection creates new data base tables to link, column 7, lines 25-35).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Chang and Meffert because using the steps of "the intermediate index comprising one or more database tables configured to map the user-identified elements in the unstructured data as the indexed elements" would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by allowing for a system that bridges gaps between platforms. This gives the user the advantage of having a mapping function to track links across platforms.

As per claims 12-15,

These claims are rejected on grounds corresponding to the arguments given above for rejected claims 2-6 and are similarly rejected.

As per claims 16-20,

These claims are rejected on grounds corresponding to the arguments given above for rejected claims 1-2 and 4-6, respectively, and are similarly rejected.

### ***Response to Arguments***

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-20 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

**Conclusion**

6. The prior art made of record, listed on form PTO-892, and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jay A. Morrison whose telephone number is (571) 272-7112. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tim Vo can be reached on (571) 272-3642. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



**TIM VO**  
**SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**  
**TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100**

Jay Morrison  
TC2100

Tim Vo  
TC2100